

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Blanche M. Manning	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	
CASE NUMBER	07 C 6240	DATE	November 9, 2007
CASE TITLE	<i>Sardisco v. Snickers Candy Bar</i>		

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT:

This case is hereby dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) as the complaint does not set forth a colorable cause of action or indicate that there is any basis for this court to exercise jurisdiction. Accordingly, all pending motions are stricken as moot and the clerk is directed to terminate this case from the court's docket.

■ [For further details see text below.]

STATEMENT

The Snickers candy bar celebrated its 75th anniversary in 2005, and its manufacturer claims that "Snickers Satisfies" candy-craving consumers. Plaintiff Daniela Sardisco, however, is not among their number. In her pro se complaint, Ms. Sardisco claims that the manufacturer of Snickers candy bars committed "quit [sic] the crime" against confectionery because the last twenty Snickers bars she consumed contained, among other things, discolored caramel, differently toasted peanuts, and bubbles, lacked a decorative swirl on the top, and were unevenly coated with chocolate.¹ Ms. Sardisco asks the court to determine how this could have happened, whether the factories will be prosecuted, and whether she will ever be able to trust Snickers again.

Ms. Sardisco seeks leave to proceed in forma pauperis. This court has the power to screen complaints filed by all litigants prior to service, regardless of their fee status, and must dismiss a complaint if it fails to state a claim or the court lacks jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *Rowe v. Shake*, 196 F.3d 778, 783 (7th Cir. 1999). Ms. Sardisco's complaint does not set forth a colorable cause of action or indicate that there is any basis for this court to exercise jurisdiction over her claims. Accordingly, this action is dismissed and all pending motions are stricken as moot. The clerk is directed to terminate this case from the court's docket.

¹ The court assumes that Ms. Sardisco intended to sue the manufacturer of Snickers candy bars, despite the fact that her complaint names a "Snickers Candy Bar" as the defendant.

RTS/c